



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

one altogether. Yet more noble and illustrious would it be to place oneself at the head of and bring to completion the movement, now so far advanced and mighty, whose aim is to uproot the whole system of war and relieve humanity forevermore from its burdens and curses. Here is an opportunity greater than any which the President has ever yet seized. Ought he not, will he not, abandon all antiquated and time-worn notions of the necessity of being armed to the teeth, and, as the highest representative of the nation which has so often honored itself by its leadership in arbitration and peace making, put himself at the head of a coalition of the nations which, at the approaching Hague Conference, will enter into a "new covenant" of justice, friendship and peace which will leave henceforth no place for war? The nations which are going to The Hague are waiting and longing for such leading. As Senator d'Estournelles de Constant has more than once pointed out, no one else is in a position to take this lead so effectually as President Roosevelt.

The President's decision to devote the amount of this prize, nearly \$40,000, to the promotion of industrial peace, by the establishment of a permanent industrial peace committee at Washington, is admirable. We had wished that it might be given, if given away at all, to the support, in some direction, of the international peace movement. If it had been put into the hands of the Interparliamentary Bureau or the International Peace Bureau, both at Berne, or given to some one of our American peace organizations, for the promotion of international friendship and peace, it would have been most productive of good in the international field, and this disposition of it would have been more in accord with the purpose of Mr. Nobel in founding the prize. However, the money was Mr. Roosevelt's, and he had the right to dispose of it as he saw fit, and we shall all rejoice that he has devoted it to so noble and useful an end.

The President's Message.

A number of topics discussed in the President's Message sent to Congress on the 4th of December deal with international affairs, and therefore claim consideration in our columns.

His sermonet on international ethics, called forth by the San Francisco-Japanese episode, is for the most part excellent. He advocates justice, disinterestedness and unselfishness in international relations. "A really great nation must often act, and as a matter of fact often does act, toward other nations in a spirit not in the least of mere self-interest, but paying heed chiefly to ethical reasons; and, as the centuries go by, this disinterestedness in international action, this tendency of the individuals comprising a nation to require that nation to act with justice towards its neighbors, steadily grows and

strengthens. "It is a sure sign of a base nature always to ascribe base motives for the actions of others." "It should be our steady aim to raise the ethical standard of national action just as we strive to raise the ethical standard of individual action."

The only criticism, if any, to be made on what the President utters on this head is that, when he declares that "no nation can afford to disregard proper considerations of self-interest," he seems to assume that self-interest, true self-interest, and unselfishness and disinterestedness are sometimes incompatible with each other. The truth is that there can be no true self-interest apart from the spirit of unselfish devotion to the true interests of others, and this is the lesson of all others which nations in their relations to each other need to learn. Ethical reasons ought always to control international action.

The President makes a strong, high-minded plea for just and fair treatment of immigrants. "Especially do we need to remember our duty to the stranger within our gates. It is the sure mark of a low civilization, a low morality, to abuse or discriminate against or in any way humiliate such stranger who has come here lawfully and who is conducting himself properly."

He demands "full and frank equality" in our treatment of the Japanese. The spirit which has excluded the Japanese children from the San Francisco schools he characterizes as a most unworthy one. It is a wicked absurdity to "shut them out from these schools, when all the first-class colleges and universities, including those of California, freely admit them." "I ask fair treatment for the Japanese as I would ask fair treatment for the Germans, or Englishmen, Frenchmen, Russians or Italians. I ask it as due to humanity and civilization. I ask it as due to ourselves, because we must act uprightly toward all men." He pledges the protection of the general government to maltreated Japanese, wherever it can act, and urges the several States to act promptly and energetically in case of ill treatment of them. He then boldly recommends that provision be made for the naturalization of Japanese who come to make our country their home. That ought to have been done long ago, and we hope Congress will promptly carry the suggestion into effect.

We do not wonder that the message, which we think truly represents the general feeling of the nation toward the Japanese, has counteracted much of the ill feeling that had sprung up in Japan, and we are glad to see that the Japanese ambassador at Washington has characterized the talk of war between Japan and this country as the height of absurdity.

In what he says of the recent action of the government in the matter of the Cuban disorder, the President assures

the world that the United States has no wish to interfere with the independence of Cuba, but only desires to see justice and order prevail in the island. What he says about certain conditions under which it would be impossible for Cuba to continue independent might better have been left unsaid. It is almost certain to stimulate to greater exertions the Americans and other foreigners in Cuba who are understood to be instigators of disorder and insurrection with the express purpose of securing the annexation of the island to the United States.

In the lengthy passage on the Pan-American conference, in which he pays a deservedly high tribute to Secretary Root for what he accomplished during his recent trip in allaying suspicion and establishing more friendly feeling in South America toward the United States, the President once more essays to interpret the Monroe Doctrine. This is, we must say, the most judicious declaration on the subject that we have seen from his pen. He assures the South American republics that this country has no intention whatever of assuming a protectorate over them or of interfering in any way with their independence. It was time for the President to say this word, for unquestionably some of his earlier utterances had had a good deal to do with developing the almost universal South American suspicion of us, of which he speaks deploringly.

In this connection the President restates the position which the United States has always taken in opposition to collecting contract debts due to its citizens in foreign countries by force of arms, and alludes approvingly to the action taken at Rio Janeiro to try to have the whole subject carefully considered at the Second Hague Conference.

The joint mediation of the governments of the United States and Mexico to arrest the hostilities last summer between the three Central American States the President alludes to as an excellent example of the kind of influence which may be exercised by our government toward securing the substitution of considerate action for "the insurrectionary or international violence which has hitherto been so great a hindrance to the development of many of our neighbors." He holds, rightly, that united action of American republics in such instances as this will tend to "strengthen the sense of international duty among governments and tell in favor of the peace of mankind."

The President urges the speedy ratification of the Algeciras convention which confers upon us equal commercial rights in Morocco with all European countries, without involving us in any European political entanglements. He does not, however, utter a word as to the higher significance of the Algeciras Conference in its important bearings on the new spirit of international coöperation and the peace of the world.

The inhumanity still connected with pelagic sealing in Behring sea, the poaching of Canadian and Japanese sealers, the inadequacy of the rules laid down by the award of 1893 to protect the seal herds, the failure as yet to get suitable agreement with Great Britain for their protection, are all treated by the President "with great plainness of speech." Unless the cruelties practiced can be arrested and the seals saved, he urges that our government proceed humanely to exterminate the herd.

On the coming Hague Conference the message communicates nothing that is really new. The President expresses satisfaction that all the American republics have been invited to join in the Conference. The date of the meeting, he says, has not yet been definitely fixed. The subjects proposed by the Russian circular last summer to constitute the program of the Conference are undergoing careful examination in preparation for the meeting. But that is all he says. There is not a word of hint that our government proposes to go into the Conference in a progressive and leading spirit. Would such a hint, diplomatically worded, have been out of place in the message?

We regret that the President should have felt it incumbent on him to follow what he rather tamely says on the Hague Conference with one of his usual fervid lectures on the righteousness of war, with his customary thrust at those peacemakers whom he this time styles "fantastic extremists." No peacemaker has ever suggested "cowardly submission to wrong." But there are other means of conquering and destroying injustice and wrong indefinitely more effective than brute force. We could wish that these had a deeper hold on the President's spirit. His statement that "the chance for the settlement of disputes peacefully, by arbitration, now depends mainly upon the possession by the nations that mean to do right of sufficient armed strength to make their purpose effective," could not well be wider of the mark. The whole history of arbitration proves the contrary. What calls arbitration into play and makes it effective is the greater intelligence, the finer conscience, the deeper sense of honor, the increased humaneness of men, and their larger appreciation of the wickedness, the injustice and the monstrous inhumanity of war, and not big armies and navies. Arbitration would go to the wall at once if brute force were its chief support.

The President gives us again his oft-repeated homily on the navy as "the surest guarantor of peace which this country possesses." This is one of his basal errors. But in one respect he has made progress in the right direction. He admits that it is no longer necessary to increase the navy. This is a new and unexpected note, when one remembers how year after he has demanded

more, ever more ships. He now asks only that new up-to-date ships, as big as the biggest and as perfect as the best, may take the place of the old ones. That is something to be thankful for. If Congress continues to grow in opposition to further naval development as it has for the last two years, under the lead of Mr. Tawney, Mr. Burton, Senator Hale and others, there is reason to hope that the President will be ready, when the Hague Conference assembles, to agree to some actual reduction of the navy, if that should be seriously put forward as a part of the international program.

The President's proposition, in the closing paragraph of the message, to establish shooting galleries in all the large public schools, as well as the military schools, and rifle clubs throughout all parts of the land, to teach all the boys and young men of the country to "shoot straight," as a preparation for possible war, stands little chance of realization. It has already stirred up much opposition among educators, who know instinctively that such a thing would be one of the deadliest blows that could be dealt to our educational system as a means of training the youth to intelligence, moral force and efficiency in comprehending and fulfilling their duties as citizens in all the walks of ordinary peaceful life. So long as military schools exist, they will of course train men to shoot. But the establishment of shooting galleries to train all the hosts of boys in the public schools in the art of shooting at their fellow men would be so wicked and inexcusable a perversion of the educational system of the country that it cannot be thought of. The people ought to beware, they will beware, of this first fatal step toward the militarization and the consequent devitalization and degradation of the nation.

The Proposed National Peace Congress.

It is felt very generally that the success of the approaching Hague Conference, at least the success which ought to crown its labors, will depend very much on the manner in which public sentiment expresses itself, between now and the date of the meeting, on the subjects with which it ought especially to deal.

The first Hague Conference was probably saved from failure, at its very opening, by the immense volume of expression of public sentiment which came to it from many parts of the civilized world,—from Great Britain, the United States, France, Italy, Holland, Switzerland, etc. The second intergovernmental Peace Conference runs a risk of a different order, namely, that of becoming a mere appendage to the first. If it is to be saved from this, and deal in a large, free, progressive way with the important international problems now pressing for

solution, it must not be left in doubt, when it meets, as to what the peoples of the world want and expect of it.

For this reason it has been thought expedient by the Directors of the American Peace Society and many others, that a National Peace Congress should be held in New York the coming spring, to voice the sentiment of the country in regard to what should be done at The Hague. On their invitation, a preliminary conference to consider the subject was held at the City Club, New York, on December 10. Representatives were present from most of the important peace organizations, and in addition a number of other interested individuals. Among those in attendance were Hon. Robert Treat Paine and Mr. and Mrs. Edwin D. Mead of Boston, Joshua L. Bailey and Alfred H. Love of Philadelphia, Dr. Philip S. Moxom of Springfield, Rev. Mr. Potter and Mrs. Adler from Hartford, Professors George W. Kirchwey, Samuel T. Dutton, John B. Clark and Dr. Ernst Richard from Columbia University, Mr. Hayne Davis, Mr. Robert E. Ely, Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer, Mr. Otto Spengler and Miss Pearson from New York, etc. Prominent persons who had been invited, but could not come, expressed themselves as heartily in favor of the proposed Congress, and wished the undertaking all possible success. Among these were President Jordan of Leland Stanford, President Seelye of Smith, William Christie Herron of Cincinnati, Hon. Samuel B. Capen of Boston, Jenkin Lloyd Jones of Chicago, President James of the Illinois State University, Ex-Senator Edmunds, John Mitchell of Indianapolis, Dr. Hiram W. Thomas of Chicago, Clinton Rogers Woodruff of Philadelphia, John B. Garrett, Rosemont, Pa., Bishop Lawrence of Boston, Moorfield Storey, Bishop Mallalieu of Auburndale, Mass., Dr. Francis E. Clark of Boston, *et al.*

Hon. Robert Treat Paine, president of the American Peace Society, was invited to serve as chairman of the meeting, and Prof. Samuel T. Dutton, Secretary of the New York Peace Society, as secretary. After an explanation by Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood of the purposes of the meeting and the character of the congress proposed, followed by a free discussion, it was unanimously voted that such a congress should be held, to arouse and concentrate American public sentiment in support, substantially, of the propositions put forward by the Interparliamentary Union and other peace organizations as demanding foremost consideration at The Hague.

It was voted that an Executive Committee of fifteen, with full powers, be appointed, seven of whom should be from New York City, to make the arrangements for the Congress. The nucleus of the Committee was formed with power to complete its membership. The Executive Committee was authorized and instructed to create a General Advisory Committee of not less than one